



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

3. That in nature and nurture the lady was the fairest flower of men and women is not unknown, not even to the few, for her maternity was of Leda, her paternity immortal by generation, but mortal by reputation, Tyndareus and Zeus, of whom the one was reputed in the being, the other was asserted in the affirming; the former, the greatest of humanity, the latter, the lordliest of divinity.

4. Of such origin she was endowed with godlike beauty, expressed not suppressed, which inspired in many men many mad moods of love, and she, one lovely person, assembled many personalities of proud ambition, of whom some possessed opulent riches, others the fair fame of ancient ancestry; others the vigor of native strength, others the power of acquired wisdom; and all came because of amorous contention and ambitious pretention.

5. Who he was, however, who won Helen and attained his heart's desire, and why, and how, I will not say, since to give information to the informed conduces to confirmation but conveys no delectation. Passing over in my present discourse the time now past, I will proceed to the beginning of my intended discussion and will predicate the causes by reason of which it was natural that Helen went to Troy.

6. For either by the disposition of fortune and the ratification of the gods and the determination of necessity she did what she did, or by violence confounded, or by persuasion dumbfounded or to Love surrendered. If, however, it was against her will, the culpable should not be exculpated. For it is impossible to forestall divine disposals by human proposals. It is a law of nature that the stronger is not subordinated to the weaker but the weaker is subjugated and dominated by the stronger; the stronger is the leader while the weaker is the entreater. Divinity surpasses humanity in might, in sight, and in all else. Therefore, if on fortune and the deity we must visit condemnation, the infamy of Helen should find no confirmation.

7. But if by violence she was defeated and unlawfully she was treated and to her injustice was meted, clearly her violator as a terrifier was importunate, while she, translated and violated, was unfortunate. Therefore, the barbarian who verbally, legally, actually attempted the barbarous attempt, should meet with verbal accusation, legal reprobation and actual condemnation. For Helen who was violated and from her fatherland separated and from her friends segregated should justly meet with commiseration rather than with defamation. For he was the victor and she was the victim. It is just therefore to sympathize with the latter and anathematize the former.

8. But if it was through *ἄλγος*'s reception and the soul's deception it is not difficult to defend the situation and forefend the accusation, thus, *ἄλγος* is a powerful potentate, who with frailest, feeblest frame works wonders. For it can put an end to fear and

make vexation vanish; it can inspire exultation and increase compassion.

9. I will show how this is so. For I must indicate this to my hearers for them to predicate. All poetry I ordain and proclaim to be composition in meter; the listeners of which are affected by passionate trepidation and compassionate perturbation and likewise tearful lamentation, since through discourse the soul suffers, as if its own, the felicity and infelicity of property and person of others.

10. Come let us turn to another consideration. Inspired incantations are provocative of charm and revocative of harm. For the power of song in association with the belief of the soul captures and enraptures and translates the soul with witchery. For there have been discovered arts twain of witchery and sorcery, which are consternation to the heart and perturbation to art.

15. Now, it has been shown that, if Helen was won over by persuasion, she is deserving of commiseration, and not condemnation. The fourth accusation I shall now proceed to answer with a fourth refutation. For if love was the doer of all these deeds, with no difficulty will she be acquitted of the crime attributed to her. The nature of that which we see is not that which we wish it to be but as it chances to be. For through the vision the soul is also in various ways smitten.

19. If, then, the eye of Helen, charmed by Alexander's beauty gave to her soul excitement and amorous incitement, what wonder? How could one who was weaker, repel and expel him who, being divine, had power divine? If it was physical diversion and psychical perversion, we should not execrate it as reprehensible but deprecate it as indefensible. For it came to whom it came by fortuitous insinuations not by judicious resolutions; by erotic compulsions, not by despotic machinations.

20. How, then, is it fair to blame Helen who, whether by love captivated, or by word persuaded, or by violence dominated, or by divine necessity subjugated, did what she did, and is completely absolved from blame?

21. By this discourse I have freed a woman from evil reputation; I have kept the promise which I made in the beginning; I have essayed to dispose of the injustice of defamation and the folly of allegation; I have prayed to compose a lucubration for Helen's adulation and my own delectation.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY.

LARUE VAN HOOK.

REVIEWS

Greek Literature. A Series of Lectures delivered at Columbia University. New York: The Columbia University Press (1912). Pp. 316.

The prefatory note tells us that these lectures were given at the suggestion of President Butler in the spring of 1911. It was intended that they should

have special reference to the universality and the permanent power of Greek literature. Professors Perry, Wheeler, Woodbridge, and Lodge of Columbia were assisted by Professors Shorey and Prescott of Chicago, Smyth of Harvard, Capps of Princeton, Perrin of Yale, and Charles F. Smith of Wisconsin, a representative body of American classical scholars of whom their fellows need not be ashamed. Professor Shorey opens the course with an introductory lecture on the Study of Greek Literature, and Professor Lodge closes it with one on Greek Influence on Roman Literature.

One would not expect to find in a collection of ten lectures by ten different men either unity or a consistent picture of the subject. The result, however, is far more attractive than any brief history of the subject that I remember. Such histories have always seemed dull, but this is not dull as a whole. Minor inconsistencies there are of course; but the shifting point of view lends a variety that more than compensates. There is unevenness of style, some unevenness of treatment, but that doesn't matter. It leads one to turn back and compare; and who does that with a regular history of literature? The total effect is that our sense of variety in that great expression of the Greek mind during a millennium or so is enhanced, and yet one gets the impression of unity after all. Especially if one turns back after the last chapter and reads again the introductory lecture. If perspective was lost anywhere meantime, that restores it, putting the emphasis where it belongs, and putting it there with that vigor and that wealth of metaphor and allusion which make Professor Shorey always readable even when one doesn't agree.

Each lecturer had a difficult task, to sum up in an hour, and in a way to hold an audience, one phase of a large subject. Different methods were demanded, and have generally been applied successfully. No doubt it was partly personal interest in the topics that led the present reviewer to find special merit of presentation in the chapters on the lyric, on tragedy, and on philosophy. The last is certainly not a subject that is easy to present to a general audience fairly as well as entertainingly. One could not go very deep; but Professor Woodbridge brings out, with just emphasis and occasionally an epigrammatic humor, the points that we all need to keep in mind if we would see aright the relations of Hellas to our intellectual world. The chapter on the Hellenistic period sometimes loses perspective. In expounding the serious importance of his topic, Professor Prescott was bound not to dwell on the vast superiority, for our educational use, of the preceding age; we can find no fault with that. But it is late in the day to speak of the Homeric Epic as "innocent of structural unity" (p. 254). "The Iliad and Odyssey remain the best constructed long poems in the world", as Professor Shorey says (p. 9). To say that "character-treatment is successfully initiated <in the Hellenistic

period>, though never becoming so deeply introspective as in modern literature" (p. 233) is to fall into a common error, but an error none the less. Homer's "characterizations are far more subtly individualized than is generally believed", Mr. Shorey remarks (p. 10). No subtler character-treatment than that of Sophokles has ever been seen. What remains true is only that morbid or bizarre types of character are more often treated sympathetically now than in the classical literature that has come down to us. But that is a different statement.

As a whole the book was well worth printing; may it circulate widely.

YALE UNIVERSITY.

THOMAS D. GOODELL.

Index Verborum Catullianus. By Monroe Nichols Wetmore. New Haven: Yale University Press (1912). \$2.00.

This index increases the obligation under which Professor Wetmore has previously placed the world of classical scholarship by his Index Verborum Vergilianus (see THE CLASSICAL WEEKLY 6.101-103, 109-111), to which the Index Catullianus is a companion volume both in style of binding and in elegance of type and paper. While based on the latest edition of Ellis (Oxford text), it contains also the variants occurring in the six most recent editions, Baehrens-Schulze, Haupt-Vahlen, Riese, Mueller, Friedrich, and Merrill. The chief difference between this index and that of Vergil is the omission of manuscript variants, for which the student is referred to the new Oxford text.

An index is a curious thing. It requires an unusual type of mind to produce a good one, and a good one is an unmixed benefit to all who want to make a thorough study of an author. Even a casual glance, however, is apt to bring to light some interesting things. In Catullus, for example, the most common verbs, omitting *sum*, are *amo*, *dico*, *do*, *fero*, and *possum*, a most illuminating indication of the armory of a lover. The personal character of Catullus's poems is shown by the fact that *ego* occurs 240 times, *tu* 252 times; *meus* is found 84 times, *tuus* 75 times. *Miser* occupies a large rôle and *maestus* is common. The negatives *neque* and *non* occur 124 times and 143 times respectively, showing that our lover was stronger on the negative than the positive side. He exclaims *o!* some 84 times and is much inclined to the exaggerated (*omnis* 76 times, *magnus* 33 times). Interesting from the point of view of style is the fact that *et* (193 times) outnumbers *que* (187 times). In the epic poets *que* is far ahead of *et*. Perhaps the verse has something to do with it. Of course *hic* is the common demonstrative (132 times); *ille* is found 82 times, is only 46 times. Here, too, we have a different usage in Vergil, who avoids *is*. Further examination would doubtless disclose many other interesting facts.

GONZALEZ LODGE.